

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Sano et al. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano et al. in view of Caillat et al. Claims 6 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano et al. in view of Bush et al. Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in the outstanding Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

It is respectfully noted that there are no rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in the outstanding Office Action.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) insofar as the independent annular ring in an annular recess of the piston, referred to in Applicant's claims 10 and 14, is not illustrated in the figures. Since claims 10 and 14 have been canceled, it is not believed that any drawing corrections are necessary.

Applicant proposes to amend Figures 1, 3, 4, 5A-5C, 6A-6C and Table 1, as illustrated in red on the attached photocopies. In Figures 1, 3 and 5A-5C, it is proposed to add the label --PRIOR ART--. In Figures 4 and 6A-6C, it is proposed to separately label each diagram. In Table 1, it is proposed to change "claim" to read --Invention--. It is believed that the foregoing proposed amendments obviate the outstanding objections to the drawings. Approval of the proposed drawings is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to Figure 10A insofar as "scrolls 10 and 20 should not be engaged axially similar to Figures 7A and 9A." It is respectfully noted that Figure 10A is consistent with pages 7 and 8 of the specification, and it is, thus, not believed that any drawing changes are necessary.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 2-5, 7-10 and 14 and has amended claim 1 to obviate the objections set forth in the outstanding Office Action. It is believed that amended claim 1 now specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 2 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Applicant's amended claim 1 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 2, thus, redrafting claim 2 in independent form. Original claims 6 and 11-13 all depend from amended claim 1. In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claim 2, it is not believed that any detailed discussion of the cited prior art references is necessary. Claims 6 and 13 have been amended to cure obvious grammatical informalities. Suffice to say that all of the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 13, 2004

By:



Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707